

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 03520 01 OF 03 011827Z

53

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 MC-02 /085 W

----- 015003

O P 011750Z JUL 75

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2511

SECDEF WASHDC IMMEIDATE

INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA

AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

SHAPE

USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 3 USNATO 3520

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING JUNE 30

REFS: A. STATE 149343

B. USNATO 3493 DTG 281250Z JUNE 75

C. USNATO 3502 DTG 301810 JUNE 75

SUMMARY: SPC MET THE MORNING OF JUNE 30 ON OPTION III. DISCUSSION CENTERED ON COMMON CEILING ISSUES AND ON EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS. UK PROPOSED REVISIONS OF US DRAFT GUIDANCE TO GIVE PRIORITY TO COMMON CEILING AS PHASE I OBJECTS, ANDD TO SEEK COMMITMENT FROM EAST TO COMMON CEILING AT "APPROXIMATELY 700,000 (900,000) MEN." NETH-ERLANDS AND BELIGUM WISHED TO ACCOMMODATE US DESIRE NOT TO ASSIGN PRIORITIES TO PHASE I OBJECTIVES, AND BELGIAN REP SUGGESTED PUTTING THEM ALL IN ONE SENTE NCE. FRG REP STRONGLY SUPPORTED THE SPECIFIC DEFINITION OF COMMON CEILING. UK, NETHERLANDS AND FRG REITERATED THEIR SUPPORT FOR INCLUSION OF AIR

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03520 01 OF 03 011827Z

MANPOWER IN THE COMMON CEILING. BELGIAN REP PORPOSED ELIMINATION OF THE PARAS IN US DRAFT GUIANCE ON EUQPMENT LIMITATIONS, AND THEIR REPLACEMENT BY A PARA STATING THAT MANPOWER CEILINGS ARE SUFFICIENT TO ENSURE QUANTITATIVE RESTRAINT ON EQUIPMENT. THIS WOULD GIE ALLIES

TIME THOROUGHLY TO STUDY EQUIPMENT CEILINGS, WHICH COULD TAKE
"UNTIL CHRISTMAS". FRG REP REITERATED FRG SUPPORT FOR USING
MANPOWER CEILINGS TO LIMIT EQUIPMENT, BUT NETHERLANDS REP
OPPOSED THIS APPROACH AS NOT LIKELY TO CONVINCE OTHER SIDE,
AND UK REP STATED THAT THIS APPROACH WOULD GIVE EAST
SCOPE TO OBJECT TO ALLIED EQUIPMENT INCREASES. RE ISSUES
REQUIRING MORE DETAILED STUDY, SPC CONSENSUS APPEARED TO
FAVOR, CONT CREATION OF A SEPARATE SPC SUB-GROUP, BUT MEETING OF SPC
AT A DIFFERENT LEVEL, IN A SMALLER ROOM, WITH ATTENDANCE BY
INTERESTED DELEGATIONS. SPC RETURNS TO OPTION III JULY2.
ACTION REQUESTED: PER REFS B AND C. END SUMMARY.

1. FRG REP (HOYNCK) EMPHASIZED THAT AT THIS STAGE OF THE
DISCUSSION, SILENCE ON ANY GIVEN SUBJECT SHOULD NOT REPEAT
NOT BE TAKEN TO INDICATE AGREEMENT WITH US PROPOSALS. FRG
GOVERNMENT IS STILL WORKING OUT ITS POSITION, AND HOPED IT
WOULD BE "ENRICHED" BY VIEWS EXPRESSED IN SPC.

2. UK REP (BAILES L) AT THE OUTSET OF THE MEETING CIRCULATED
THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTED REDRAFT OF PARAS 1 AND 3 OF THE US
DRAFT GUIDANCE. SHE SAID UK WAS NOT PROPOSING LANGUAGE ON
PARAS 4-8 AT THIS TIME, SINCE CEILINGS ISSUES REQUIRED FURTHER
STUDY.

3 BEGIN UK TEXT

PARAGRAPH 1

"THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS ARE AUTHORIZED TO PUT FORWARD THE
FOLLOWING PROPOSAL TO THE WARSAW PACT;

THE ALLIES PROPOSE:

A. THAT IN PHASE I BOTH SIDES SHOULD UNDERTAKE A COMMITMENT
TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF APPROXIMATE PARITY AS THE GOAL OF THE NEGOT-
IATIONS IN THE FORM OF A COMMON CEILING ON GROUND (AND AIR)
MANPOWER IN THE AREA OF REDUCTIONS. THIS COMMON CEILING WOULD BE
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03520 01 OF 03 011827Z

SET AT APPROXIMATELY 700,000 (OPPNPPPL MEN:

B. THAT IN ADDITION TO THE WITHDRAWAL IN PHASE I OF 29,000
US SOLDIERS THE US WOULD WITHDRAW A SUBSTANTIAL PORTION OF ITS NUCLEA
R
CAPABILITY IN CENTRAL EUROPE, NAMELY 1,000 NUCLEAR WARHEADS, 54 US
NUCLEAR CAPABLE F-4 AIRCRAFT AND 36 US PERSHING MISSILE LAUNCHERS:

C. THAT THE SOVIET UNION WOULD WITHDRAW IN PHASE I A TANK
ARMY CONSISTING OF 5 DIVISIONS INCLUDING SOME 68,000 SOVIET SOLDIERS
AND 1,700 MAIN BATTLE TANKS."

PARAGRAPH 3

"AS REGARDS TACTICS THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD, AS SOON AS PRACTICABLE, PUT FORWARD ALL THE PROPOSALS IN PARAGRAPH 1 ABOVE SIMULTANEOUSLY. THE NUCLEAR ELEMENTS SHOULD NOT BE SEPARATED. THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS SHOULD RECALL THAT THE ORIGINAL WESTERN REDUCTIONS PROPOSALS FOCUSED ON REDUCING THE DISPARITY IN THOSE ELEMENTS, NAMELY GROUND FORCE MANPOWER AND TANKS, WHICH THE WEST SEE AS A MAJOR DE-STABILIZING FACTOR IN CENTRAL EUROPE; THE NEW WESTERN-MOVE TAKES ACCOUNT OF CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY WARSAW PACT NEGOTIATORS ABOUT AIR AND NUCLEAR ELEMENTS".

END UK TEXT

4. UK REP SAID THAT THE UK PROPOSED REVISIONS OF PARAS 1 AND 3 OF THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE WERE INTENDED TO IMPLEMENT POINTS MADE BY THE UK AT LAST WEEK'S MEETINGS. SHE NOTED THAT THE UK REVISION OF PARA 1 REORDERS THE ELEMENTS OF THAT PARA TO MAKE CLEAR THAT THE MAIN OBJECTIVE WAS THE COMMON CEILING. THE UK PUT BRACKETS AROUND WORDS REFERRING TO INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE COMMON CEILING ONLY BECAUSE ONE COUNTRY (BELGIUM) STILL OPPOSED THIS. UK STILL BELIEVES INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE COMMON CEILING IS THE BEST WAY TO HANDLE AIR MANPOWER.

5. SHE SAID THAT THE UK REVISION OF PARA 3 REMOVES FROM THE US SORRYING THE IDEA THAT WE ARE FOCUSING ON WHAT EACH SIDE

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03520 01 OF 03 011827Z

CONSIDERS THE MOST THREATENING ELEMENTS. THE UK PROPOSED LANGUAGE STATES THAT THE WEST SEES GROUND FORCE MANPOWER AND TANKS AS A MAJOR DESTABILIZING FACTOR IN CENTRAL EUROPE, AND THUS GETS BACK TO THE MAIN ALLIED OBJECTIVE OF ELIMINATING MANPOWER AND TANK DISPARITIES.

6. NETHERLANDS REP (MEESMAN) SAID THAT UK REP HAD COVERED THE POINTS HE HAD WANTED TO MAKE AND HE WAS IN FULL AGREEMENT. HE ALSO NOTED THAT NETHERLANDS, LIKE THE UK, CONTINUES TO SUPPORT INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE COMMON CEILING.

7. CANADIAN REP (BARTLEMAN) SAID THAT HIS INSTRUCTIONS WERE ALONG THE SAME LINES AS THE REMARKS BY UK REP. HOWEVER, CANADIAN AUTHORITIES WISHED TO COMPLETE "DATA STUDIES" BEFORE FIXING A NUMBER FOR THE COMMON CEILING.

8. FRG REP (HOYNCK) SAID THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WERE NOT YET IN A POSITION TO SUGGEST LANGUAGE RE THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE. THEY REGARD THE US DRAFT AS HELPFUL, AND A GOOD BASIS FOR DISCUSSION. THE SPECIFIC FORMULATIONS IN THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE REQUIRE VERY CAREFUL CONSIDERATION. SOME POINTS IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE REPRESENT CLEAR PROGRESS, E.G. MOVING FROM ASKING EASTERN AGREEMENT TO THE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT

TO ASKING EASTERN COMMITMENT TO THE COMMON CEILING APPROPRIATELY DEFINED. HE SAID BONN'S THINKING WAS IN THE DIRECTION OF THE RE-VISION SUGGESTED BY UK. FRG, LIKE THE UK AND NETHERLANDS, CONTINUES TO FAVOR INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE COMMON CEILING, ALTHOUGH FRG IS NOT SURE WHERE OR HOW TO PUT IT IN THE GUIDANCE. FRG LIKES PARA 5 IN THE US DRAFT RE EQUIPEMENT, AND WELCOMES THE CLEAR STATEMENT IN PARA 9 ON NON-INCLUSION OF ALLIED SYSTEMS. FRG IS GLAD THAT US WISHES TO TABLE OPTION III AS ONE PACKAGE. THE TIME HAS NOT YET COME TO GO INTO DETAILS OF WORDING. FRG REP THEN CIRCULATED THE FOLLOWING LIST OF SUBJECTS REQUIRING FURTHER DISCUSSION WITHIN SPC OR OPEN-ENDED CAUCUS.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03520 02 OF 03 011902Z

41
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 MC-02 /085 W
----- 015423

O P 011750Z JUL 75
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2512
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORTY WQQTR
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 3 USNATO 3520

9. BEGIN FRG TEXT

SUBJECTS REQUIRING FURTHER DISCUSSION WITHIN SPC OR OPEN-ENDED CAUCUS.

--DEFINITION OF A COMMON CEILING

--LIMITATIONS ON SOVIET TANKS AND
--US TANKS

--INCLUSION OF NUCLEAR ELEMENTS ONLY IN PHASE I

--MAINTENANCE OF FOCUS ON MANPOWER REDUCTIONS

--DEFINITION FOR THE WEAPON SYSTEMS TO BE REDUCED

--INTERNCONNECTION BETWEEN OPTION III AND THE PROPOSAL
OF A COMBINED COMMON CEILING.

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03520 02 OF 03 011902Z

END FRG TEXT

10. BELGIAN REP (WILLOT) SAID HE WAS STILL OPERATING FROM
GENERAL, RATHER THAN SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS. HE SAID THE UK
REVISIONS WERE ALONG THE LINES OF WHAT BELGIUM HAD IN MIND.
HOWEVER, IN THE UK FORMULATION IT WAS NOT CLEAR THAT THE ALLIES
IN PROPOSING OPTION III ARE OFFERING AN EXCHANGE, OR TRADE.
HE MISSED THE WORD "EXCHANGE" A CONCEPT COVERED BY THE WORD "IF" IN
PARA 1 OF THE US DRAFT. IN PARA 1 A OF UK REVISION, THE WORD "OVERALL"

SHOULD BE INSERTED BEFORE "GROUND MANPOWER". BY "OVERALL" HE MEANT
COLLECTIVE. HE REMINDED SPC OF THE CONTINUED BELGIAN RESERVE ON
INCLUSION OF AIR MANPOWER IN THE COMMON CEILING. HE SAID THIS IS A
POSITION HE MUST DEFEND, ALTHOUGH HE DID NOT KNOW WHAT HIS
FINAL INSTRUCTIONS WOULD BE. HE LIKED PARA 3 OF UK REVISION BUT HE
FAVORED AN ADDED PARA 4 IN WHICH THE ALLIES SHOULD MAKE CLEAR TO THE
OTHER SIDE THAT THIS IS A FINAL OFFER. HE PROPOSED ADDING A PARAGRAPH
INSTRUCTING THE AHG TO MAKE CLEAR TO THE EAST THAT THIS
OFFER IS FINAL IN THAT NEITHER THE US NOR ANY OTHER WESTERN
PARTICIPANT WOULD AGREE TO FURTHER EQUIPMENT REDUCTIONS.

11. ITALIAN REP (SPINELLI) AGREED THAT THE ALLIES SHOULD
NOT GIVE THE EAST FURTHER EQUIPMENT REDUCTIONS, BUT THAT THE ALLIES
MUST WORRY NOT ONLY ABOUT THE DANGER THAT THE OTHER SPC WOULD ASK
FOR MORE, BUT ALSO THAT THE EAST WILL NOT BE READY TO GIVE ENOUGH
IN RETURN FOR OPTION III. THESE TWIN DANGERS WERE INESCAPABLE IF
OPTION III WAS OFFERED AS A SINGLE PACKAGE.

12. US REPS WELCOMED UK EFFORT TO EXPRESS ITS VIEWS IN DRUQT
LANGUAGE, AND SAID THAT THE US STILL CONSIDERS IT UNWISE TO
SPECIFY NUMERICALLY THE COMMON CEILING. THE SECOND SENTENCE
IN THE UK PARA A APPEARS DESIGNED TO DO THAT. THIS WOULD
BEND TO BRING INTO PHASE I ISSUES BETTER LEFT FOR PHASE II.
IN PARTICULAR, IN COMMITTING THE EAST TO A SPECIFIC OUTCOME,
WE WOULD BE ENCOURAGING THE EAST TO PRESS THEIR DEMAND THAT THE
ALLIES BEGIN TO NEGOTIATE NOW ON ALLOCATION OF PHASE II REDUCTIONS.

13. US REPS AGREED TO BELGIAN REP'S PROPOSAL TO INSERT
"OVERALL" FORCE TO GROUND FORCES AND WELCOMED HIS SUPPORT OF
CONCEPT OF EXCHANGE. THEY POINTED OUT THAT THE UK LANGUAGE
ESTABLISHES PRIORITY IN FAVOR OF COMMON CEILING OVER WITHDRAWAL
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03520 02 OF 03 011902Z

OF TANK ARMY AS PHASE I GOALS. A PRIORITY FOR ONE OF THESE GOALS ONLY DINIGRATES THE OTHER. OUR PHASE I GOALS ARE A PACKAGE, EQUALY IMPORTANT. RE BELGIAN SUGGESTION THAT WE TELL THE EAST THAT WE WILL OFFER NOTHING MORE ON EQUIPMENT, THIS MIGHT SOUND LIKE WEAKNESS, BUT US WILL REFLECT ON THIS IDEA.

14. UK REP ASKED CLARIFICATION OF "ILLUSTRATIVELY" IN THE US PARA 1. US REPS SAID THAT IS LANGUAGE FROM C-M(73)83 WHICH THE ALLIES HAVE BEEN USING ALL ALONG. AN ALTERNATIVE MIGHT BE THAT BOTH SIDES WOULD UNDERTAKE TO ELIMINATE THE DISPARITY AND MAKE NO MENTION OF NUMBERS. BELGIAN REP NOTED IMPORTANCE BELGIUM ATTACHES TO COMMON CEILING OF 700,000, IN ORDER TO SAFEGUARD POSITION THAT ALLIED REDUCTIONS SHOULD NOT EXCEED 10 PERCENT. HOWEVER, HE OPPOSED UK IDEA OF SEEKING EASTERN AGREEMENT ON THIS NUMBER RIGHT AWAY. HE OFFERED TWO REASONS: FIRST THAT ALLIES SHOULD BE WILLING TO ACDEPT A COMMON CEILING FORMULA THAT WOULD SAVE EASTERN FACE; AND SECOND THAT THE EAST COULD HARDLY LIVE WITH A COMMON CEILING AT ANY OTHER LEVEL, AND SO BURDEN OF ADVANCING A DEFINITE FIGURE SHOULD BE PLACED ON EAST. FRG REP SAID THAT UK LANGUAGE WENT ONLY SLIGHTLY BEYOND WHAT WE HAD ALREADY TOLD THE EAST ON THE COMMON CEILING, AND THIS FURTHER SPECIFICITY WOULD BE THE ONLY QUID PRO QUO FOR OPTION III BEYOND THE EXISTING ALLIED OFFER. HE STATED THAT THE MORE SPECIFIC THE COMMON CEILING IS, THE MORE FLEXIBILE FRG CAN BE ON ISSUES SUCH AS "TIME BETWEEN PHASES". HE STATED THAT THIS IS A CENTRAL POINT FOR FRG.

15. UK REP STATED THAT ANY EXPLICIT AGREEMENT TO ELIMINATE DISPARITIES WOULD HAVE TO BE BASED ON PRIOR AGREEMENT ON THE SIZE OF THE DISPARITY. SHE IMPLIED THAT THIS DID NOT APPLY TO A COMMON CEILING SET AT AN AGREED NUMBER.

16. NETHERLANDS REP SAID NETHERLANDS HAS ALWAYS CONSIDERED THE MAIN PHASE I OBJECTIVE TO BE THE COMMON CEILING CONCEPT. NETHERLANDS ACCEPTS THE US WISH TO AVOID INDICATING PRIORITIES TO EAST, BUT FEARS THAT THE US APPROACH GIVES HIGHER PRIORITY TO TANK ARMY. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT ANY LISTING OF GOALS WOULD ESTABLISH PRIORITIES, AND THAT THE ONLY POSSIBILITY WAS TO PUT EVERYTING IN ONE SENTENCE, FOR EXAMPLE: "IN EXCHANGE FOR EASTERN AGREEMENT TO REDUCTIONS LEADING AT

SECRET

PAGE 04 NATO 03520 02 OF 03 011902Z

THE END OF PHASE II TO AN APPROPRIATELY DEFINED COMMON CEILING ON OVERALL GROUND AND AIR MANPOWER, AND, IN A FIRST PHASE, TO WITHDRAWAL OF A SOVIET TANK ARMY, THE AHG IS AUTHORIZED TO OFFER IN ADDITION TO THE NOVEMBER 22ND PROPOSAL, THE WITHDRAWAL OF... ETC.

17. BELGIAN REP, NOTING HIS OPPOSITION TO FIXING OF CEILINGS, PROPOSED THE ELIMINATION OF PARAS 5-8 IN THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE, AND THEIR REPLACEMENT BY A PARAGRAPH

STATING: "IN GENERAL THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS
SHOULD CONTINUE TO ARGUE THAT CEILINGS ON ALL MANPOWER OTHER
THAN NAVY, CONTAINED IN THE WESTERN PROPOSALS, ARE SUFFICIENT TO
ENSURE IN PRACTICE A QUANTITATIVE CONSTRAINT ON EQUIPMENT."
WHILE MAINTAINING THIS POSITION WITH THE EAST, THE ALLIES WOULD
BE ABLE TO STUDY THIS QUESTION IN DEPTH.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 03520 03 OF 03 011928Z

53
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 USIE-00

INRE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-02 INR-07 IO-10 L-03

NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 TRSE-00 NSC-05 BIB-01 MC-02 /085 W
----- 015825

O P 011750Z JUL 75
FM USMISSION NATO
TO SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2513
SECDEF WASHDC IMMEDIATE
INFO USDEL MBFR VIENNA PRIORITY
AMEMBASSY BONN
AMEMBASSY LONDON
USNMR SHAPE
USCINCEUR

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 3 USNATO 3520

18. NETHERLANDS REP DOUBTED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES WOULD ACCEPT THIS APPROACH. THE OTHER SIDE WOULD NOT BELIEVE THAT A CEILING ON MANPOWER WOULD PREVENT THE ALLIED FROM INTRODUCING NEW EQUIPMENT. FRG REP SAID ALLIES NEED TO STUDY THIS SUBJECT. FRG HAD MADE SOME STUDIES ON LIMITING TANKS BY MANPOWER LEVELS, AND THESE STUDIES INDICATED SUCH A LIMIT MIGHT WORK. THIS MIGHT BE A SUBJECT FOR THE OPEN ENDED CUCUS PROPOSED BY THE US. NETHERLANDS REP SAID IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO HAVE THE FRG STUDIES. BELGIAN REP SAID THAT HIS PROPOSAL WOULD GIVE THE ALLIES TIME TO CONDUCT THE STUDIES WHICH WERE NEEDED ON THIS SUBJECT. OTHERWISE THE ALLIES MIGHT NOT BE ABLE TO INTRODUCE OPTION III UNTIL CHRISTMAS. CANADIAN REP (BARLEMAN) SAID IT WOULD BE PREMATURE TO GO INTO PARAS 5-9 OF THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE UNTIL MILITARY TECHNICAL STUDIES HAD BEEN CONDUCTED. HE THOUGHT THE ALLIES WOULD WORK MORE URGENTLY ON SUCH STUDIES WITHOUT THE STATEMENT TO THE EAST WHICH BELGIAN REP HAD PROPOSED.

19. UK REP CAUTIONED AGAINST CLAIMING TO THE OTHER SIDE THAT

SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 03520 03 OF 03 011928Z

MANPOWER CEILINGS RESTRICT EQUIPMENT. IF THEY RESTRICT EQUIPMENT, THEY RESTRICT NON-US ALLIED AIRCRAFT. UK SAW TWO DANGERS HERE. FIRST, IF THE EAST SAW SOME SUCH AIRCRAFT BEING INCREASED, THE EAST COULD SAY THAT OUR MANPOWER CEILINGS WERE NOT FULFILLING THEIR PURPOSE. SECOND, IF THE ALLIES LATER OFFERED THE EAST LIMITED CONSTRAINTS ON SOVIET AND US EQUIPMENT, THE EAST COULD SAY THAT THIS WAS AN ADMISSION THAT THE NON-INCREASE COMMITMENTS ON MANPOWER WERE INSUFFICIENT.

20. FRG REP SAID THAT IT WAS NECESSARY FOR ALLIES TO HAVE A FINAL POSITION ON EQUIPMENT LIMITATIONS BEFORE OFFERED OPTION III TO THE OTHER SIDE SINCE AS UK REP HAD POINTED OUT, WHAT IS AT STAKE ARE THE ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS OF THE ALLIED POSITION. ITALIAN REP SAID THAT EVEN IF THE ALLIES REACHED INTERNAL AGREEMENT ON CEILINGS THERE WOULD STILL BE THE PROBLEM IN PARA 5 OF THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE OF DECIDING WHETHER THE EAST HAD MADE "AN INSTRUCTED RESPONSE" AND COULD THEREFORE BE GIVEN THE PRINCIPLES ON CEILINGS CONTAINED IN PARA 5. THERE SHOULD BE SOME MECHANISM WHERE THE AHG WOULD FIRST TELL THE NAC WHAT THAT "INSTRUCTED RESPONSE" IS.

21. US REP NOTED THAT US WANTED TO DEAL WITH ARMAMENTS LIMITATIONS TO THE EXTENT WE HAD PROPOSED, IN ORDER TO PUT A RESIDUAL LIMIT ON THE NUMBER OF SOVIET TANKS, TO PROTECT OUR OPTIONS TO INTRODUCE ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS IN THE NAC, AND TO SHOW THE EAST THAT WE ARE OFFERING MEANINGFUL REDUCTIONS.

22. CHAIRMAN (KASTL) RAISED THE QUESTION OF THE SUPPLEMENT TO THE DRAFT GUIDANCE, WHICH HE REFERRED TO AS A PARALLEL PAPER. US REPS SAID THE SUPPLEMENT WOULD BEST FORM PART OF THE DRAFT GUIDANCE PAPER, REFLECTING ALLIED AGREEMENT ON SPECIFIC ISSUES BEYOND THE AGREEMENT REGISTERED IN THE DRAFT GUIDANCE ITSELF. FRG REP SAID FRG WAS FLEXIBLE ON THE FORM OF THIS PAPER, BUT DUGGED THAT IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO REGISTER ALL ADDITIONAL ELEMENTS OF THE ALLIED POSITION IN THE SAME PAPER AS THE DRAFT GUIDANCE. RE THE FORUM FOR WORK ON ISSUES REQUIRING DETAILED ANALYSIS, CONSENSUS OF SPC APPEARED TO BE THAT FOR CONSTITUTIONAL REASONS IT WOULD BETTER NOT TO CREATE A SEPARATE SUB-GROUP OF THE SPC, BUT RATHER FOR THE SPC TO MEET AT A DIFFERENT LEVEL, IN A SMALLER ROOM, WITH ONLY THOSE COUNTRIES ATTENDING WHO CONSIDERED THEMSELVES DIRECTLY CONCERNED.

23. CHAIRMAN RAISED THE QUESTION OF WHETHER SPC SHOULD MEET
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 03520 03 OF 03 011928Z

IN AUGUST ON OPTION III. HE SAID SPC COULD CERTAINLY MEET, BUT HE ASKED IF THERE WOULD BE SUFFICIENT INSTRUCTIONS FROM CAPITALS. IN HIS SIX YEARS AT NATO HE HAD ALWAYS FAILED TO ACCOMPLISH MORE THAN A WEEK OR SO OF REAL WORK IN AUGUST, WITH THE REST OF THE TIME SPENT IN IDLE WAITING. ITALIAN REP AGREED, AND SAID HE DID NOT EXPECT MUCH BY WAY OF INSTRUCTIONS IN AUGUST. HE

THOUGHT THAT IT WOULD BE UNNECESSARY TO REACH AGREEMENT IN AUGUST SINCE NEGOTIATION DOES NOT RESUME IN VIENNA UNTIL LATE SEPTEMBER. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT THE HAUGE WILL BE MANNED IN AUGUST FOR THIS SUBJECT, GIVEN ITS URGENCY, AND HE HOPED OTHER COUNTRIES WOULD MAKE SIMILAR EFFORTS AT NATO AND IN APITALS. FRG REP SAID HE THOUGHT THE WORK WOULD PROCEED MORE EXPEDITIOUSLY IF EVERYONE AGREED TO SCHEDULE A CERTAIN PERIOD IN SUGUST WITH NO OPTION III ACTIVITY, PERHAPS A PERIOD OF TWO WEEKS OR SO. THIS SUGGESTION WAS NOT TAKEN UP.

24. SPC WILL RETURN TO OPTION III ON WEDNESDAY, JULY 2.

WE SHALL DISTRIBUTE IN ADVANCE OF THAT MEETING THE FOLLOWING LIST OF TOPICS ARISING OUT OF THE US DRAFT GUIDANCE (THIS LIST WAS WORKED OUT AFTER JUNE 30 SPC MEETING BY US, UK, AND FRG REPS): (1) DEFINITION OF A COMMON CEILING; (2) OTHER EQUIPEMENT IN THE TANK ARMY, APRTICULARLY FROGS AND SCUDES; (3) DEFINITION OF TANKS TO BE REDUCED; (4) ADEQUACY OF MANPOWER LIMITS TO CONSTRAIN TANKS; (5) DEFINITION OF AIRCRAFT TO BE REDUCED; (6) INCLUSION OF NUCLEAR ELEMENTS ONLY IN PHASE I; AND (7) INTER-CONNECTION BETWEEN THE NUCLEAR OFFER AND AIR MANPOWER. THIS LIST CONTAINS THE BASIC ISSUES OF CONCERN ARISING OUT OF THE DISCUSSION SO FAR, AND SOME WILL REQUIRE DETAILED ANALYSIS IN MORE RESTRICTED SPC. WE WOULD EXPECT THAT MAIN SUBSTANTIVE ISSUE DISCUSSED ON JULY 2 WILL BE DEFINITION OF COMMON CEILING, AND THAT THE JULY 2 DISCUSSION WILL RESULT IN ASSIGNING SOME OF THE OTHER ISSUES FOR MORE DETAILED WORK IN MORE RESTRICTED SPC.

25. ACTION REQUESTED: SEE REFS B AND C.

STREATOR

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptoning: X
Capture Date: 18 AUG 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 01 JUL 1975
Decapton Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decapton Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1975NATO03520
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1975/newtext/t197507102/abbrzkuf.tel
Line Count: 467
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 9
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. STATE 149343 B. USNATO 3493 DTG 281250Z JUNE 75 C. USNATO 3502 DTG 301810 JUNE 75
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 02 APR 2003
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <02 APR 2003 by lzenbel0>; APPROVED <07 APR 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
06 JUL 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: OPTION III: SPC MEETING JUNE 30
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF IMMEIDATE INFO MBFR VIENNA
BONN
LONDON
SHAPE
USCINCEUR

Type: TE

Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 06 JUL 2006